

Remarks

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested. The drawings were objected to. Attached are revised drawings marked REPLACEMENT SHEET. The drawings contain no new matter and should now be in full conformance. The specification has also been amendment to conform to the revised drawings. No new matter has been added to the drawings or the detailed description.

The title was objected to. The title has now been revised and should more clearly indicate the novel features of the present invention.

Claims 1-6, 11, 13-17 and 20 were rejected under Section 102 as being anticipated by Lusebrink. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claims 2, 13 and 16 have been canceled to facilitate the prosecution of this application.

To summarize the present invention, it is an effective mirror system that enables the driver to simultaneously view objects, such as other vehicles, located at a rear and along the side of the vehicle and other vehicles located in a blind spot area of the vehicle (best shown in Fig. 8).

It is submitted that none of the cited references teaches or suggest these features.

Lusebrink merely teaches a mirror system in which the rear mirror 32 has two fields (34, 35) so that the driver may see the left side (as projected by the left-side periscope device) and the right side (as projected by the right-side periscope device) of the vehicle. In this way, the driver can see both sides in the same mirror 32. The driver can see along the sides of the vehicle as shown by the arrows 19, 20. It should be noted that the arrows are parallel to the sides of the vehicle. It should also be noted that Lusebrink was filed in 1948. This was a time when multiple lane highways were not used and blind spots were thus not a problem yet. This may be one explanation why Lusebrink is only concerned

with parallel views along the side of the vehicle.

It is submitted that Lusebrink and the other cited references completely fail to teach or suggest a first flat mirror in the second section that is disposed at a non-parallel angle relative to the a second flat mirror also disposed in the second section to enable the driver to simultaneously see both the blind spot area (via the first flat mirror) and along the side of the vehicle (via the second flat mirror).

In contrast, Lusebrink has only a simple prism at each the outer end of the periscope devices so that the driver can only see the area that is parallel to and along the side of the vehicle, as shown by the arrows 19, 20. The mirrors 32 and 26 cooperate and have a viewing surface in an interior of the vehicle. Mirror 26 is forwardly facing while mirror 32 is rearwardly facing. An important feature is that mirror 32 must face mirror 26 so that beam 36 can be reflected by mirror 26 onto mirror 32 (best seen in Fig. 3).

It is submitted that Lusebrink would require extensive modification to include the unique features of the present invention. More particularly, Lusebrink completely fails to teach or suggest using two different flat mirrors in the second section that are angled relative to another so that both the blind spot area and the view along the side of the vehicle may be seen by the driver wherein the second section is where the mirror housing is optically open to the outside of the vehicle (portions 16 in Lusebrink). Lusebrink also completely fails to teach or suggest two angled mirror in the second section that are facing the rear of the vehicle.

Applicant fails to see why a person of ordinary skill in the art would look to Lusebrink to learn about the idea of using two differently angled flat mirrors in the second section so that both the blind spot and the rear of the vehicle may be seen by the driver when Lusebrink completely fails to teach such features.

As indicated above, it should be noted that mirrors 26, 32 are not located in the second section, as defined in the amended claim 1, wherein the second section is optically open to the outside of the vehicle i.e. portions 16 where the prisms 17 and 18 are located. In contrast, mirrors 26 and 32 have viewing surfaces in the interior of Lusebrink's vehicle and are thus located in the first section. Also, mirror 26 is forwardly facing. The amended claim 1 specifically requires that both the first and second mirrors are located in the second section of the mirror system. Also, the amended claim 1 requires that both the first flat mirror and the second flat mirror face the rear of the vehicle. It is submitted that if Lusebrink is modified so that both mirrors 26 and 32 face the rear of his vehicle his invention would not work since Lusebrink's mirror system requires that mirror 26 is facing forwardly to reflect the light beam 36 to the rearwardly facing mirror 32. It is therefore submitted that the features of the present invention are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by the cited references.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the amended claim 1 is allowable over the cited references.

Claims 3-6, 11, 14-15, 17 and 20 are submitted to be allowable because they depend upon the allowable base claim 1 and because they include limitations that are not taught or suggested in the cited references.

Claims 7-10, 12, 18-19 were rejected under Section 103 as being obvious over Lusebrink. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 7-10, 12, 18-19 are submitted to be allowable because they depend upon the allowable base claim 1 and because they include limitations that are not taught or suggested in the cited references.

The application is now submitted to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

5 Respectfully submitted,
FASTH LAW OFFICES

/rfasth/

Rolf Fasth

10 Registration No. 36,999

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 513.1158USN

15 FASTH LAW OFFICES
26 Pinecrest Plaza, Suite 2
Southern Pines, NO 28387-4301
Telephone: (910) 687-0001
Facsimile: (910) 295-2152
20 Email: rolf.fasth@fasthlaw.com

cc: James W. Carson, Blaney McMurtry LLP
(Your Ref. 096065-003)